

Violation of the norms of speech behavior as a cause

Furman Nellu

Modern Language Association, USA

ABSTRACT

The article analyzes the speech conflicts, the occurrence of which is due to violation of verbal behavior. We investigated the conflict episodes in the spontaneous speech of students of Russia. Typology identified and the reasons for such conflicts, their prevalence in the student communication. It was found that in the everyday discourse of equal status of participants in the communication conflictogenic becomes deviant speech behavior associated with non-compliance with the rules of morality and politeness principle. Norm verbal behavior has been the object of special consideration only at the end of the twentieth century. Interest in their study was stimulated by the approval of the anthropocentric paradigm of modern linguistics, the formation of the communicative approach to learning the language of matter, becoming pragmalinguistics and new retheroic. The relevance of this sector, and due to the social importance of following the rules of communication, the need to maintain and develop a common voice and common culture.

KEYWORDS: rules of verbal behavior, verbal conflict, speech etiquette, communication student.

A study of normative speech behavior develops in two main directions: one involves identifying the common logical communication rules governing the mechanisms of understanding the meaning of its members G.P. Grice, D. Gordon, George Lakoff, T.W. Shmelev, N.V. Muraviev, and others, both associated with the analysis of socially constructed norms of verbal interaction, defined by the prescriptions of morality, originality of national culture and mentality, character role relations between the communicants and other factors (V. E. Gaulle J.

Leach N.I. Formanovskaya, I.A. Sternin, V.I. Gzavava, A.G. Balakay and many others. et al.

In the reconstruction of national codes verbal behavior (including the Russian speech code) common disorders and diagnosing its rules researchers rely on works of art and paremias attract experimental, using materials of films, film scripts, talk shows. The norms of speech behavior in everyday communication of representatives of various social strata studied not enough; This situation also applies to student discourse. Among the features of speech behavior of students in the work of B.J. Sharifullina S. Leorda M.R. Shelhovskoy, A.Y. Larionova referred to the possibility of "code switching", depending on the communication environment (changing set of forms of speech in accordance with the requirements of specific small groups), extensive use of slang, profanity and precedent texts, beginning of creative expression, including the game; the desire to make his speech colorful, bright, custom. Marked individual deviations from the commonly accepted use of etiquette formulas reduction and increasing aggressiveness speech, however, the subject of special consideration, they were not in communicative plane.

The object of this article - voice conflicts (R.K.) in the student's environment, the occurrence of which is connected with the violation of verbal behavior. The aim is to identify the causes of such conflicts and their typology. The work is part of research student disputed communication. Material analysis served as a Dictaphone recording 186 episodes of conflict in the spontaneous speech of students of Tomsk.

Causes of RK in recorded texts are very diverse; the most important of them are connected with the violation of property rights, mismatch worldview communicators, non-compliance with ethical standards. Part of the episodes (about 16% of the total) shows that the conflict can also be caused by violation of the norms of speech behavior. The available texts reveal the composition of such disorders and their prevalence in a conflict communication.

Most R.K. frequency, caused by the absence of expected displays of empathy by the communication partners. A conflict of this type can be observed in cases where a positive emotional state of one of the communicating parties can not find support from the other side:

Passing by C and A. saw walking down the street L. classmate, got off the bus and caught up with her.

A. (knocking L., jokingly): She can meet you?

A.: Oh, hi. Where are you from here?

S. (happily): We saw you at the crossroads. We got off the bus ... And here we are!

L. (without emotion): Cool.

A.: Are you not happy to see us?

L. (without emotion): I'm glad. I'm always glad to see you.

S.: Something for you quickly.

L.: And what do I do? Jump?

S.: jump.

L.: No, I can All the same, I will not jump, but I was very tired?
(Smiles sadly)

S.: We have, therefore, to see you happy, even ran out of the bus, ran to you, out of breath, but you (netsenz. In the "indifferent" sense). OK, but.
<...>

The expression of sincere joy at meeting old friends refers to the rules of etiquette verbal behavior. Girlfriend expects from L. mirror reaction to his own verbal behavior, left disappointed and resentful indifference of their fellow students: L. radostnoshutlivoy did not support the tone of the dialogue, formally Eaten her verbal indicators manifestations of positive emotions (Cool, I'm always glad to see you) did not meet unemotional intonations and facial expressions.

A stronger negative reaction to a manifestation of emotional deafness interlocutor, when the speaker expects empathy in difficult situations and not get it. Episodes such cause RK occur much more frequently than the above. In this conflict-could be incorrectly chosen interlocutor tactics rational support, or criticism.

Line management of encouragement, elected member of the dialogue, neverbalizovannost emotional component of communication in such cases is perceived as a lack of support in general:

Telephone conversation being on friendly terms E. girl and guy L.

E.: I was put in the hospital.

L.: It's not scary.

E.: You (netsenz. In the sense of "indifferent"), is not it?

A.: I do not (In the "indifferent" sense). Nothing wrong. All placed in a hospital.

E.: I'm shocked.

L.: But you'll be fine. Che are you shocked?

E .: I told you ten hours ago, said that my temperature under forty, not once during this time did not ask whether the improved state of health worsened there and said that I was put in the hospital, said "very good" (netsenz.) it is true that one learned in trouble.

L .: Yes, calm down. I also had a temperature of forty, and I also put in the hospital before (netsenz.) Again. Nothing wrong with me. Just

I know if it is not to think about, it is likely to be held. Th you start immediately "friend - not a friend?" <...>

E .: If you're sick, and I knew about it, I would (netsenz.) Every five minutes asking how your health is. Besides, you know what it is (netsenz.) State it so difficult to maintain? And do not send to the hospital. It can be seen, it is difficult. Well. We immediately see what a person is sincere and what's not. That's how people fall into the eyes. <...>

Instead of sympathy and consolation girl expected the words of a young person uses a generalized judgment, stressing the ordinariness of the situation (all put in the hospital, that's okay; I, too, was the temperature of forty, and I also put in the hospital <...> Nothing happened to me.) and attracts rational arguments (but you'll be fine, if not to think about it, you probably will be held). Interlocutor perceives such verbal behavior as inconsistent with the status of non-compliance and other "common courtesy." Her statement also contains a normative, according to the students, the type of reaction to the manifestation of attention (If you're sick ...), and the preferred strategy (is it so hard to maintain?); under the support we have in mind is the emotional empathy. The origins of the conflict, possibly

Contentious and criticism is the behavior of the interlocutor, runs counter to the intended expression of sympathy and encouragement:

The girl and the guy T. O., good friends, met in the hallway hostel.

A .: How are you?

T .: Good. How about you?

A .: The same. How to pair?

T .: Yes, all bad ... a lot of debt.

A .: So you guys are learn, and that's a lot !!!

T .: Good girl what to say! And in general to you always with all my heart, and you're all backwards!

A .: How is it ?! Well and ham! I want the best! I kick you!

T .: What am I, a hedgehog to me kicked ?! It does not bother me at all! <...> Poorly selected O. tactic reproach to induce other to Corrected

The definition (I want the best! Pina you!) causes offense T. (to you always with all my heart, and you're all backwards!), his sarcastic remarks contribute to the escalation of the conflict.

A variety of verbal clashes of this type can be considered a response to the whining participant communication - constant, annoying complaints interlocutor. Their systematic instead of sympathy awakens anger and aggression (Stop whining. Your nagging me already. Every day I hear it from you. <...> And generally it's as if I am guilty, that you something is wrong and you are such a loser in life!), Provoking level

The term conflict interaction.

A common cause of RK among the students can be considered as reluctance to support communication. In general, there is no ethical standards prescribed always take part in a conversation initiated by someone; In addition, the unwillingness to communicate is usually primary reasons that lie outside the scope of the speech. However, if these reasons are unknown to others, who are forced to live a long time in the same space or to engage in joint activities, permanent no voice contact is considered unacceptable and creates conflict.

Dissatisfaction communication initiators induce reluctant, monosyllabic, formal answers to their questions, accompanied by irritated tone:

Dorm room; Three girls - A., B., C.

A.: B, and we have a first pair of tomorrow?

B.: I do not know.

A.: You stood at the schedule today.

B.: I do not remember!

Q.: Are not you recorded?

B.: No.

A.: A second well - Slovak?

B. (irritably): I do not know.

Q.: Yes, Slovak.

A.: In the third, probably, yes?

B. (irritably): I do not know.

A.: And something happened?

B.: What happened?

A.: Ah you so answer? <...>

similar reactions lead nonverbal manifestations of negative feelings with unclear motivation for the behavior of others: L.: You're tired of being angry, if you do not like something, say so, and then go if not sewn mare's

tail. S.: Yes, everything is normal. A.: According to you and to be seen. <...> You walk around with a sour face. Say nothing, do nothing. It is not right. We are not guilty, that you have a bad mood. Get up - angry, go - angry, come - evil. Myto what is to blame? Not the way it should be.

Unfriendly character is and ignoring the interlocutor, breach of etiquette rules preferences verbal communication to all other activities in the case of the arrival of the guest. In the following episode of violation of this rule is combined with a demonstration of unwillingness to communicate, verbalized in the laconic negative replicas ID, use it declarative tactics preferences of their own interests (pour itself; I'm busy, and I want to sit), the calling tone. Behavior girlfriend W. estimated as gross and evil:

D & D - the girlfriend, a roommate in a dormitory. W. (D. enters the room): Would you like a cup of tea?

D.: I've just about. Already I poured myself, so pour herself tea.

(Sit down to drink tea)

U.: Maybe kakoyribud see a movie?

D.: No. You see, I'm busy.

W. (evil): What are you busy? You sit in contact?

D.: Yes. Why do you care? And I want to sit.

W.: You see, I have come to you. Have a drink with you tea. Can you give me the time and to break away from his debility contact?

D.: No

U.: Why are you so angry and rough lately? Can you stop me rude? You already got with his rudeness. <...>

Reluctance to maintain communication can grow and complete cessation of verbal contacts at the initiative of one of the members of the small group (usually students living together in a dorm room or a rented apartment). Not motivated speaking violation companionship, involving sociability and openness, creates unfriendly, tense atmosphere and is recognized as a deviation from the norm:

R.: No, it is normal that we are living with you in the same room and not talk?

S.: OK.

P.: It seems to me that there is.

In all conflicts cause of this group is itself verbal behavior, which leads to an imbalance communicative by him and its uncertainty motifs for others. As shown by the material, the resolution of such Kazakhstan is pos-

sible only in cases where an individual violates the rules surrounding clarifies the true causes of their behavior.

In a number of reasons and student communication episodes involve a violation of the principle of respect for the partner. Contentious tactics are aimed at belittling the role of communication participant or his humiliation.

Speech is a conflict, if the communication partner becomes an object of banter. Chaffing prevalent among students; at the same time, the initiators are not always able to distinguish between jokes and humiliation of human dignity. Verbal behavior jokers, which is based on self-affirmation at the expense of elected for teasing a "victim", causing resentment and protest:

A. and B. joke that is similar to B. grandmother Alexander A.: Oh, yes, my grandmother still does not drink!

B.: Vahaha, see V. - you just Grandma! (Jokingly laughs)

Q.: Yeah (offended, not looking at him).

(B. begins depict grandmother lisp, etc.).

V. (offended): Enough, but already!? Constantly kakieto fun, as though I am a clown you. I'm tired already.

A.: A Th this? I just said that my grandmother does not drink! And yet!

V. (offended, annoyed): Already got, making fun of others!

A. and B. looked at each other and were silent. They all sit in silence.

In a situation chaffing disapproval expressed implicitly and sometimes absent; offense communication participant may cause not only a hint of his negative qualities, but also a sense of alienation, a sense of his exclusion from the group of close friends:

O instead of the word "sauna" was heard in conversation A. and B. "wedding"; He begins to ask about the wedding.

A.: It should be less in the headphones sit, you would know everything was.

B.: Yeah. (Laughter girls)

A.: Well, seriously, tell me, what kind of wedding? Who?

B.: Yes, that's, I'm getting married (joking). A, do not say anything, do not tell (conspiratorially).

O. (offended): I'm tired, really.

A.: Well, I'm sorry (sincerely regret).

O. (indignantly, dramatically throwing things in the package): Yesterday, today, tomorrow - let us every day!

A.: A., we love.

O. (sullenly, angrily): Uh-huh.

As can be seen from the context, a painful reaction to banter exacerbates the systematic use of this tactic (Continuing this fun, as though I am a clown you are bored already. Yesterday, today, tomorrow ...). The examples show that the participants of rallies do it without malice (we love) and resentment of the object of jokes is for them a surprise.

Disrespect to the communicative partner can manifest itself also in violation of role expectations of participants in the communication. Since household communication students in their social group is a fellowship of equals, the cause of conflict is verbal behavior of their peers, who takes on the role of senior status. He begins to use the destructive tactics of the order, the teachings, the prohibition of negative evaluation, allows himself or overbearing tone. Violates the rules of speech etiquette illegal Rebuild horizontal relations (equal - equal) in the vertical (senior - junior) [8.p. 7] offends communicant, feels unjustly humiliated, limited in their rights:

K. and N., roommates, engaged in cleaning.

H.: And wipe off the table (by fiat tone).

K.: Good (wipes).

N.: I'm with you, as a mother and daughter potter (with irony in his voice).

K.: And who asks you, (netsenz.), So messing with me, huh?

N.: Yes, you did differently! (rough)

K.: Yes? (Drawling) You know what? Even my mother does not allow himself to specify how and what to do. I am an adult, and she has the right to decide how and what to do. Clear? A not you teach me.

Fixed, moreover, conflicts caused by slander. Backbiting as "evil assessment" [25. 613], in contrast to the banter, always realized in the form of an open, verbalized conviction surrounding a purported demonstration of superiority over them:

A.: I saw what Sedna J. priperlas?

B.: No, not seen.

A.: Well, honestly, from my grandmother's trunk got, not sweater jacket. Horror, in short!

B.: Yes, okay, what's the difference who is in what goes ?!

A.: Well she was more modest, but it claims to be the first fashionista on the faculty. <...> At it all looked so!

B.: I was not looking! A. Now let's not discuss people's clothing!

A.: A Th this? Type you are so all good. I gossip? You're so expose me?

B.: You herself in that light you expose! <...>

A.: Ah you its so hard to protect?

B.: I'm tired of the shit that you me about our friends!

All! Enough!

A.: I'm not talking about you!

B.: Thank God, I have such criticism could not stand it and shoot!
(Leaves the room).

This case, Kazakhstan reflects the close linkage of verbal behavior disorders non-compliance with the ethical rules of "do not judge others." In the episode A. incorrectly interprets this provision, considering it to be binding only in the characterization of the interlocutor (I'm not talking about you!). In the conventional sense, shared B., a ban on the negative assessment applies to the whole range of communication communicants.

The student discourse meets Kazakhstan, which can be considered the cause of a violation of privacy sphere. Its manifestations include interference in other people's conversations:

Dorm room. K. engaged, S. communicate immediately with N. K.:
N., you're talking about the function of the nature of Che wrote?

C. (after a pause, confused): But nothing that we speak?

K.: And Che, I can not now say Nitsche?

S.: You could say, "Excuse me, may I interrupt you?"

K.: Well, I'm not apologized, now what?

S.: Well, which one is no longer with me. This is your problem, or your parents, that the basic rules of decency you have not learned. <...>

Replica communicants in such dialogues show that foreign interference is always a negative reaction.

Zod: But you, in my opinion, no one asked anything!; Somehow not subject wedged in a strange conversation !; Let's agree that you will not climb into other people's conversations when you do not ask) and is perceived as a violation of elementary filtration rules of decency, This necessarily implies an apology.

This group should include the conflicts caused by the disclosure of personal information, complaining of a loved one to third parties. If interference in other people's conversations is a universal communicative taboo (for I.A. Sternin) that does not depend on the proximity of the communication

partner, in this case the parties to the conflict are the students who are on friendly terms, or young student couples:

M. and N. - neighbor in a rented apartment, girlfriend, odnogrúppnitsy. N. (serious tone, low voice): We need to talk.

M. (lays knitting, watching at close range): What is it?

N. (clearly, in a raised voice): You know, I'm on you I never expect that you will (netsenz.) About me all sorts of people left !!! <...>

M. (calmly, cautiously): You mean K, or what?

H.: And about how you (netsenz.) Sour look on my face. <...>

M. (low voice): I had to talk to someone.

N.: I. Weak? (Pause)

M. (through tears): I did not want to swear. <...>

Both cry. Reconciliation.

Kazakhstan is the basis of such a violation of the informal rules of friendship, as confidence in the other, the preservation of trusted secrets, no public criticism. Disclosure not to be made public information and complaints on a boyfriend or girlfriend to outsiders, as the episode that may arise as a result of the need for psychological relaxation (I had to talk to someone), but they are regarded as a hostile verbal behavior. A preferred embodiment of elimination of tensions that have arisen between loved ones, is their open discussion without outside interference.

May be a reason for ignoring speech these formulas dog-salmon - by definition, N.I. Forman prescribed by society, sustainable means the system to establish voice contact and maintain communication.

Disuse etiquette formulas leads to the RC infrequently.

Those episodes where students come into conflict on this issue, there are differences between them in the assessment of the significance of traditional etiquette behavior of markers. So, good wishes good night for one of the participants in the communication - a sign of caring and tenderness, and for another - a mere formality:

A guy and a girl, both 20 years old.

P.: Why do you not answer me yesterday? Even the "good night" I did not write?

D.: Yes, I'm with the girls swing. I thought I answered. <...>

P.: So you do not value that you write to me?

D.: Nuuu ... "good night" - is, in principle, a formality!

P.: "good night" to me means that I want you to sleep well, not stupid form of politeness!

D.: A "thank you" mean for you every time, "God bless you"? Come on!

P.: How is it okay? Maybe you can tell me that "I love you" - is also a formality? <...>

Just differently perceived by the presence / absence of speech greeting formulas. One of the communicants gives them a great importance as a courtesy Score varies educated man from the cattle, whereas his companion does not notice violations rules of etiquette friendly enough considering the exchange of remarks about affairs:

V. girl, 19 years old, a young man Alexander, 17 years - friends. They meet by chance in the street.

A.: Hi, how are you?

Q.: It's okay! Do you like?

A. (indignantly): And to greet you at first did not teach?

A.T. (Surprised, not understanding): And what raznitsato? I just answered your question!

A. (roughly): Does not matter, you had to first say hello! And not as a cattle kakoeto behave! <...>

Note that the ellipsis many etiquette formulas do not reflective in a relaxed household communications that relate to the supervision of SV Leorda their lakonizatsii in student communication. Are more likely to become conflict-no apology (as a sign of recognition of guilt and self-affirmation of one another) and the greeting (as a manifestation of a sign of respect).

Analyte student discourse shows that most of the causes of RK multifaceted. First, violations of verbal behavior - a special case of violation of the general rules of humanistic morality, implies respect for the human person, kindness, compassion, compassion, honesty, etc.; This confirmed episodes above. Second, in many situations, conflict interaction due to the simultaneous violation of several norms of etiquette verbal behavior. Here as an illustration of this thesis one concise episodes.

Dormitory. Students and came into their room in a student play "Mafia".

M.: guys (netsenz.), It is necessary to vote!

I.: In our room the girls can not swear (with irony in his voice).

M.: I (netsenz.), That can not be in your room. Want - a mother, I want to - do not use foul language.

I. (netsenz.): Hence mater where you want.

M.: Well, ok.

M. leaves the room, all the girls go for it.

This situation is caused by the conflict use of a category of speech taboo. Saturation student discourse obscene vocabulary and phraseology - in same-sex teams, and between girls and boys who are in friendship or a relationship, is quite high, and usually as a breach of etiquette rules recognized only use direct invectives interlocutor. However, gender roles - a set of expected behavior of samples (or standards) correlated with sexual accessory speaker - prescribe limits their increased profanity female individuals compared to men. Thus, the cause of the conflict may also be violation role expectations. For groups whose members are not familiar, it is obvious preserved traces of taboo mat in communication between the sexes. Development of Kazakhstan contributes not only offhand declaration, but also the transition from relaxed I. forms of expression to the demand using confrontational tactics and linguistic resources of the "repertoire".

This form of conflict scenarios is quite typical for student discourse. It represents the third component in the complex causes of conflict: an important factor in its genesis is the dominance of hate speech participants in the dialogue. In the primary violation of the norms of speech behavior of communicants prefer to respond to conflict. Inability to control his emotions and neutralize starting the conflict leads to a wider use of destructive speech tactics (reproach, teaching, insult, interdiction, prosecution ...) with the corresponding speech markers (rising tone of voice, intonation irritation, indignation, irony, sarcasm, vocabulary and phraseology, et al.). Thus, intonation conflict typically has the following scheme: "violation of verbal behavior by X - Y aggressive reaction";

Group considered Kazakhstan to be distinguished from the conflicts that are similar to them in appearance but different in nature. In these episodes, one of the participants in communication perceives the verbal behavior of the interlocutor as a deviant, while his partner violation of the norms of speech is not recognized and is not intended to:

A. and B., roommates and girlfriends.

A .: Tell me, what do you advise me to do with statistics?

B .: Well, you leave a couple of examples that you're not going to sound, or no examples of the very simple classification.

(A long silence. A council ponders and looks, twisting his face in disbelief, disapproval.)

B .: Damn, Well that's what you looking !? Why then do you ask advice, if still not listening and watching as such I generally carry some politi-

cal garbage, and you're still going to do in his own way? .. Do not ask then, did itself, and everything!

A .: I'm sorry, I was just thinking how to do. I did not mean to offend you.

B .: Yes Nitsche.

Such situations are "masked" by the norms of speech violation, but is a case of communication failures arising due to incorrect interpretation used by the partner verbal and nonverbal means.

Thus, a student can distinguish speech group caused deviant behavior of speech communicators. The originality of the composition of speech violations of norms, based on the analysis of which is possible the reconstruction of the speech code of the participants of communication, largely due to the specifics of the considered discursive sphere. In ordinary conversation, these rules are much less strict than in the institutional discourse; moreover, involving people of similar age and a social status in the student communication, usually familiar with each other. In connection with the two designated circumstances many of the rules of verbal behavior, relevant to the conditions of official communication and hierarchically structured groups with different social roles, lose relevance. It can be assumed available materials are almost absent of Kazakhstan, which can be considered the cause of non-compliance with the allocated GP Grice logic rules effective voice communication - maxim number (whether information), quality (its truth), the relevance (sequence started by a subject) and clarity of expression¹. Most episodes of conflict of student discourse suggest that the breach of verbal behavior is a special case of non-compliance with ethical standards and can be considered as their variety. It is obvious in everyday communication is important not so much the accurate transmission of factual information as the observance of the norms of morality and politeness principle (by J. Leach).

Causes of Kazakhstan among students in cases of breaches of etiquette verbal behavior are primarily related to the lack of expression of empathy (about 1/3 of all episodes); further descending marked reluctance to support verbal communication, breach of the principle of respect for the partner and the scope of privacy, ignoring the speech etiquette formulas. verbal interaction is manifested in conjunction with the conflict-speech tactics and corresponding language means. Development of conflict contribute to the failure of communicants field of ethics of knowledge, inadequate capacity for em-

pathy, inability to restrain negative emotions and aggressive reaction of the participants to communicate in deviation from normative behavior.

REFERENCES

- Grice, GP (1985) Logic and speech communication. Translated from English. In: Arutyunova, ND & Paducheva, EV (eds) New in foreign linguistics. Vol. 16. Moscow: Progress.
- Gordon, D. & Lakoff, J. (1985) The postulates of speech communication. Translated from English. In: Arutyunova, ND & Paducheva, EV (eds) New in foreign linguistics. Vol. 16. Moscow: Progress.
- Shmeleva, TV (1983) Code of verbal behavior. 1. pp. 72-77.
- Murav'eva, NV (2002) Speech mechanisms of communication conflicts in media texts. Philology Dr. Diss. Moscow.
- Gol'din, VE (1978) Etiquette and speech. Saratov: Saratov State University.
- Leech, G. (1983) Principles of Pragmatics. London; New York: Longman.
- Formanovskaya, NI (1989) Speech etiquette and culture of communication. Moscow: Vysshaya shkola.
- Sternin, IA (1996) Russian speech etiquette. Voronezh: Voronezh State University.
- Gzavava, VI (2000) Russian speech etiquette: a sociocultural aspect. Philology Cand. Diss. Krasnodar.
- Balakay, A.G. (2002) Russian speech etiquette and principles of its lexicographical description. Philology Dr. Diss. Novokuznetsk.
- Biryulina, A.I. (2009) Evolution of Russian speech etiquette (in the fiction of the 19th-21st centuries. Philology Cand. Diss. Tambov.
- Speranskaya, A.N. (1999) Rules of verbal behavior in Russian proverbs. Philology Cand. Diss. Krasnoyarsk.
- Zubareva, A.A. (2007) Formulas of Russian speech etiquette: a sociolinguistic study]. Abstract of Philology Cand. Diss. Perm.
- Averkieva, M.S. (2009) The semantic and conceptual spaces of Russian etiquette. Abstract of Philology Cand. Diss. Ekaterinburg.
- Vorontsova, T.A. (2006) Verbal aggression: penetration into the communicative space. Izhevsk: Udmurt State University.
- Kremneva, M.G. (2009) The image of the normative verbal behavior and verbal discourse correction (in the English and Russian languages)] Abstract of Philology Cand. Diss. Moscow.
- Glushak, V.M. (2010) A linguisticpragmatic aspect of verbal behavior of communicants in everyday communication (in the German language). Abstract of Philology Dr. Diss. Moscow.
- Annenkova, D.V. (2011) The components of the perception of verbal behavior (in the Russian and German languages). Abstract of Philology Cand. Diss. Voronezh.

- Sharifullin, B.Ya. (2005) Speech portrait of the modern student: the first glance. In: Kim, IE (ed.) *Linguistic Yearbook of Siberia*. Vol. 7. Krasnoyarsk: Krasnoyarsk State University.
- Leorda, SV (2006) Speech portrait of the modern student. Abstract of Philology Cand. Diss. Saratov.
- Shelkhovskaya, MR (2008) The language picture of the world of the student]. Abstract of Philology Cand. Diss. Chelyabinsk.
- Larionova, A.Yu. (2011) The informal student discourse: a sociolinguistic and cultural linguistic aspects. Abstract of Philology Dr. Diss. Ekaterinburg.
- Konishcheva, NS & Gundyayeva, O.V. (2005) Russian speech etiquette. Nizhniy Novgorod. [Online] Available from: <http://www.studfiles.ru>.
- Evgen'eva, AP (ed.) *Dictionary of the Russian language*. 2nd ed. Vols 1-4. Moscow: Russkiy yazyk.
- Kon, IS (1980) Friendship: an ethical and psychological essay]. [Online] Available from: <http://www.ereading.by/bookreader.php>
- Formanovskaya, N.I. (2003) Speech etiquette. In: Karaulov, Yu.N. (. Ed) *Russian language: Encyclopedia*. Moscow: Bol'shaya Rossiyskaya entsiklopediya.
- Denisova, AA (ed.) (2002) *Dictionary of gender terms*]. Moscow: Informatsiya XXI vek.